

**Meeting Description:** Michigan Geographic Framework Users Meeting

**Date:** September 10, 1999 **Time:** 10:00 a.m.

**Location:** Lewis Cass Bldg., 6th Floor, North Wing, Dept. of Management and Budget, Director's Conference Room

Scheduled Time			Actual Time		
Start	Stop	Total Hours	Start	Stop	Total Hours
10:00 a.m.	12:00 p.m.	2	10:00 a.m.	12:00 a.m.	2

## MEETING MINUTES

### I. Geographic Framework Project

#### A. MIC Project Update

##### 1. MALI to GIS Conflation (Phase 2a) Status

Rob Surber, MIC, distributed a Phase 2 status map, indicating that 24 counties are currently in progress. Some counties have reached the identity point, which is an important point in the process. This is the point where the existing physical reference (PR) numbers in MALI have been fully accounted for in framework. The remaining work involves adding the new information in MALI and the GIS.

#### B. Framework Update and Maintenance

##### 1. NSDI Clearinghouse

Rob Surber, MIC, reported that the MIC is working on update and maintenance of the framework. The MIC has a relationship with IMAGIN focusing on the establishment of a clearinghouse node for Michigan. The purpose will be to provide Metadata on available Michigan GIS data. Though a formal decision has not been made, it is planned that IMAGIN will work on a survey to gather core information and create an inventory of its members' Geospatial data holdings. Most of the data will not be available on the site, but the site will point users to where they can find the data (a phone number and contact person.) One MIC staff person will be attending clearinghouse training in Charleston, SC, sponsored by FGDC. As a state, our efforts will tie into FGDC standards, for the development and maintenance of a node. In addition, all of the framework data procedures and quality control documentation will be provided, which is important to support framework users and partners. The clearinghouse will be a 24 hours a day, 7 days a week support system.

##### 2. Washtenaw, Livingston, St. Clair Counties

Rob Surber, MIC, reported that the MIC has received three completed counties from SEMCOG. SEMCOG has taken these counties through the steps in their process. The MIC will begin the process of conforming the information to the rest of the state to have consistency throughout.

##### 3. U.S.G.S. States Workshop

###### a. Status Maps (<http://mcmcweb.er.usgs.gov/status/mcmc/mi/index.html>)

Rob Surber attended a 3½ day U.S.G.S. workshop in Rolla, MO. Representatives from eastern and mid-continent states were invited to attend as a means of

communicating the U.S.G.S. mapping programs to the states. The first major announcement of the meeting was regarding the digital raster products for the 48 contiguous states. Rob distributed a handout displaying the availability of Digital Raster Graphics (DRG), and useful background information regarding the evolution of the mapping program.

Rob Surber stated that this announcement was followed by a discussion of the national mapping program - where they are and where they are going. There was a discussion about how funds will be distributed for the four main products - DOQs, DRGs, vector data, and DEMs. The U.S.G.S. is still committed to DOQs. The funding, which has been jumpstarted by the NRCS and other federal agencies, is now decreasing. In the future, there will be more of a focus on partnering with stakeholders who have an interest for their area.

Rob Surber also reported that the U.S.G.S. will continue to create DEMs. States not covered will be completed next year (spring or summer.) DEMs in SDTS format will be distributed free of charge to the MIC and DNR. Each DEM covers a 7.5 minute quadrangle. Rob referred to products listed in the 'Evolution of the U.S.G.S. Mapping Program' handout. The DEM status can be seen at the URL listed above. They intend to enhance the status maps at this URL so that users will be able to click their mouse on a tile and will be able to determine what level DEMs they are looking at in the state.

Rob Surber commented on the national map dissemination program. There is going to be a change in the map product distribution policy. Past policy was to ship new maps to all receiving agencies in an ongoing basis. Now products will only be distributed to business partners for resale or to cooperative partners who provide map updates. Many states indicated they would not be ready for this change in policy. The State of Michigan may not automatically get maps. Rob is hoping that if enough interest is generated, they may be able to develop a partnership plan and will be able to work something out. Some states are finding that some agencies are receiving multiple copies of maps from both the U.S.G.S. and the lead agency of the state. By eliminating duplicates, the U.S.G.S. can probably cut costs. Overall there was a lot of frustration, since this is a national service and people feel they may not be served. There was also discussion about the Earth Science Information Centers (ESIC) and whether its function should be reviewed. After the U.S.G.S. presentations, the state caucuses made recommendations about how the U.S.G.S. can help the states. The results will be reported to the geographic framework group after U.S.G.S. publishes this.

Rob Surber also commented on the creation of vector data. The vector data production at the U.S.G.S. will see a decrease in funding. The vector program has been focusing on the creation of hydrological and transportation databases. The hydrographic data set project has recently been made the top priority and a lot of staff resources are being placed there. The result will be a hydrographic layer, 1:100,000 scale, which will contain EPA River Reach codes. The creation of a national transportation layer is up in the air right now. Arguments were made by Georgia and Michigan that the U.S.G.S. has historically been the base map caretakers. Who else will step up and take over? Who else is in a position to provide production and staff to handle national transportation data sets? The U.S.G.S. is still committed 100% to framework. States involved in a base map creation without an NSDI focus will not be considered high priority. The MIC has applied for an innovative partnership with the U.S.G.S. for the creation and maintenance of the framework base and as far as Rob knows, the process is still moving along.

Rob Surber reported on the U.S.G.S. raster update. The U.S.G.S. will be updating the top selling 5,000 quadrangles in the U.S. There are not a lot of quadrangles for Michigan – some are in Oakland County and there is a smattering of others

throughout the state. We, as a state, could partner with U.S.G.S. and get selected quads updated for a reasonable amount of money. As a state, we must look at recommendations from the workshop and decide how important they are for our work.

Rob Surber reported that the MIC has received approximately 800 DEMs for Michigan. They will import and will make a raster format available possibly through the clearinghouse. They will initially do one or two as a test. For visualization, it may be nice to drape DEMs on top of framework for an output that is visually pleasing. The MIC will also get DEMs for the rest of the state as they become available.

### C. SEMCOG Project Update

Delores Andaluz distributed a status handout. SEMCOG will continue to work on files on Phase 2a . They have completed Oakland and Macomb counties through Phase 1 and both counties are now in conflation clean up phase. They are now working on Monroe and Wayne Counties in the conflation phase.

Joyce Newell, MDOT, asked when Livingston County would be through the MIC process. There is an interest for 911 purposes and if it will not be completed until spring, they may want to do something on their own.

Rob Surber, MIC, stated that the next county assigned was going to be Washtenaw. Will have to take this information into consideration.

Delores Andaluz, SEMCOG, stated that Washtenaw County has twice as many arcs as Livingston County.

Joyce Newell, MDOT, requested a time frame.

Rob Surber, MIC, was hesitant to commit at this time.

Tina Roberts, Wayne County, asked about the MIC's process after they receive SEMCOG's product.

Rob Surber, MIC, responded that the file is run through 40–50 validation programs. A lot of work has already been done and there is a need to create transaction files for the migration of older versions of MALI.

Gordon Rector, U.S. Bureau of the Census, asked if the process includes the addition of information from the QVF maps.

Rob Surber, MIC, responded that the MIC is working with the DNR to get a set of 1998 digital ortho quad photos for the SEMCOG region. There may be additional roads on the DOQs. Canton Township did a lot of work on their QVF and it will be incorporated into the framework with DOQs as a backdrop.

Gordon Rector, U.S. Bureau of the Census, stated that in one month they will be able to give the MIC another TIGER line file which is being produced for LUCA program. These files represent TIGER as of February 1998. Information received through QVF by November 1997 will be reflected.

Tina Roberts, Wayne County, asked if changes would be delivered back to SEMCOG as they are made.

Rob Surber, MIC, stated that there would be a change transaction matrix of the nodes and arcs of the original coverage that had been revised.

Tina Roberts, Wayne County, stated that Wayne County is interested in doing additional conflation to the base, but maybe they had better wait until this file is ready.

Rob Surber, MIC, stated that the 1998 version of the map will be distributed from a Transportation Management System (TMS) perspective. Standardization of attributes will be constant. Then we will have a clear path so we will know what has been done to the files. A decision needs to be made regarding how to handle ongoing maintenance. Our commitment is to make sure there is a clear trail showing how changes have been made. At this point, quarterly updates will be the most frequent releases available. It may depend on how often users wish to update their own files. We may provide quarterly update versions but at a minimum there will be annual updates to the files. The change transaction file is a county-based file and can be segmented out by selecting out arcs and making changes. This will be discussed further.

Bill Enslin, MSU Center for Remote Sensing and GIS, asked if this approach of tying transportation data and a linear referencing system together in a statewide product is common around the country.

Rob Surber, MIC, responded that there was a discussion at the federal meeting that Vermont and Georgia are trying a statewide approach. A lot of states are looking at the program and questioning what it would take to create a statewide framework. Not all states are tying their transportation departments in with mapping nor are they concerned about a cartographic product. Transportation planning folks often are not interested in cartography. Michigan is a little different since MDOT is an active partner in the framework.

## II. MDNR Projects and Activities

Rob Surber, MIC, stated that the DNR has the framework products and has done analysis between old MIRIS and new framework features. The results will be shared with the MIC and MIC will produce a response.

## III. MDOT Projects and Activities

Joyce Newell, MDOT, reported that she attended a Roadsoft users' meeting. They are anxiously awaiting availability of more counties. Roadsoft developers hope to have data converted by spring. They are starting to look at a plan to incorporate GIS into Roadsoft. Joyce provided a list of county road commissions that are interested in map review products of Phase 2 framework. County road commissioners are hopeful that roads that are now missing will be included in the framework.

Joyce Newell also stated that MDOT is working on a potential agreement with Michigan State Industries (MSI) to do road attribution. The project is looking favorable. This agreement will avoid the need for MDOT to hire temporary staff. MDOT anticipates going for an onsite visit to see the operation and the opportunity to ask questions.

Joyce Newell stated that MDOT is looking at how to incorporate and make changes to versions within the Transportation Management System (TMS). They are unsure which version to use as a base. There will be a problem with years between 1995-98. A data team will meet to determine which version to use. They will look at summary data between different years. They will need to look at a piece of road to see what happens over time and then they will need a second set of data to compare it to. Historic data brought to current year is not always useful, for example, crash sites brought forward may not have had an intersection in the historic data.

## IV. MIC Projects and Activities

### A. Executive Information System

Rob Surber, MIC, stated that there is a meeting scheduled with ESRI on Friday regarding the Executive Information System (EIS) effort. The DNR will be participating in this meeting. The EIS will be an intranet-based application for executives within state agencies to access information regarding state properties. ESRI will demonstrate how they can provide assistance. This promises to be a useful product.

#### B. Enhanced Access 2000 Project

Rob Surber, MIC, reported that the MIC is creating maps to be used in an intranet application for the Enhanced Access 2000 Project. Maps, data, and products are posted to a server for the caucuses and governor's office. An example was displayed. Maps are made available in HPGL and PDF formats. Maps were created using framework geography and TIGER polygons. A series of AMLs are used to automate map production. Operators only have to move a few labels. The AMLs create three line layers - roads, hydrology, and railroads. The size of the labels is based on the scale of the map. The lines are consistent map to map. Presently the maps display state house and senate districts. The MIC will then create maps by county. New polygons will be created using the framework. Cities and townships are now required to use physical features when making changes to the precinct boundaries. The process for closing polygons in framework will be scheduled with the Dept. of State. Polygons will be maintained on framework as a service. The TIGER version will be kept for redistricting, therefore changes will be made on TIGER first and then on framework.

#### V. MDEQ Products and Activities

Rob Surber, MIC, reported that the MIC met with DNR and DEQ to talk about hydrological data and the framework. The group wants to establish a hydrographic coding system incorporating the EPA River Reach system and ecosystem attributes. The first action items are technology and other U.S.G.S. associated issues. There is a need to determine what specifications have been developed. There have been some AMLs created to conflate River Reach data to 1:100,000 scale hydrological features. The group is also looking at creating applicable AMLs to create 1:24,000 scale. Conflation tools have been developed, but they are unsure how transferable they are to the hydrological world. The next meeting is scheduled for September 24. There may be a pilot project with U.S.G.S. They are currently interested in an innovative partnership and then will set up a timeframe to work on hydrological data. If anyone is interested in joining the group, now is the time. The Land and Water Division at DEQ is recognized as the key contact for now. Rob is attending meetings and will report on progress.

#### VI. SEMCOG Projects and Activities

Delores Andaluz, SEMCOG, corrected a statement that she had made at the previous meeting – the Detroit Edison's data is +/-10 feet when overlaid with MI Geographic Framework for Washtenaw County.

Delores Andaluz reported that roads that are added to MIRIS are appended TIGER arcs. They are finding a little adjustment to MIRIS. TIGER arcs that are not found in MIRIS are private roads. In some cases finding lot of discrepancy in roads in original MIRIS not matching the Detroit Edison file. They are questioning how to make use of these files, may be able to use as a source to update files. They are using GDTs to update new roads and rights-of-way. It is clear to see where new development taking place. The Detroit Edison information is applied to GIS data before site plans have been approved (power is the first thing needed at a new site.), therefore the site may not actually exist yet.

Tina Roberts, Wayne County, commented that by law the Detroit Edison has to supply electric as soon as the plans are submitted. The site is put on maps immediately. She commented that this might be a good source for the MIC to use to update to 1998.

Delores Andaluz stated that this data does have street names and addresses. The Detroit Edison does their updates on weekly basis. They are discussing which road features they want to put in the files.

Gordon Rector, U.S. Bureau of the Census, stated that the Detroit Edison has loosened up on sharing information.

Delores Andaluz commented that it took about a year to establish this relationship. The Detroit Edison is interested in replacing GDT's street centerline with SEMCOG's centerline file. It would be easy to snap to the framework file. Covers almost all of the SEMCOG region - off only by 10-15 townships. Coverage goes into Sanilac and Shiawassee Counties missing parts of Livingston and Monroe.

Rob Surber, MIC, stated that he has offered to meet with Consumer Energy and hasn't heard back from them. Rob has also talked to MICHCON, they are working in areas of the state to create digital orthos. The MIC has not established a partnership with them at this time

Delores Andaluz stated that they are working on centralizing their GIS area (support and specialists.) Steve Perry will be working on file management, data dictionary, and FDGC standards. Ellen Waller will be working on technical support and program support. Deana McIntosh will be working on data requests. Tammi Shepherd is in transportation and they have quite a few projects going on. They are currently working with 5-6 transportation planners. SEMCOG is migrating from Unix to NT ArcInfo.

Delores Andaluz also stated that the conversion of NAD 27 to NAD 83 is on their minds. If they convert framework files, they plan to convert all files. They will look to MIC to alert them as to what to look out for. Files are in state plane and plan to stay in it since most local communities use state plane.

Tina Roberts stated that they will be converting the Detroit plane into the state plane.

Delores Andaluz stated that if GeoRef is requested, they may refer to MIC to figure out.

Rob Surber stated that the MIC is putting SEMCOG files into Michigan GeoRef NAD83 meters.

## VII. Tri-County Regional Planning Commission Projects and Activities

Nothing to report

## VIII. MSU Center for Remote Sensing and GIS Projects and Activities

Bill Enslin, MSU Center for Remote Sensing and GIS, stated that they are offering ArcInfo classes. The first one is offered the end of September and it is full. They have added an additional Introduction to ArcView class, scheduled for January 20-21. ESRI has established a training class schedule for January through June. The schedule is available on their web site ([www.esri.com](http://www.esri.com)). Other universities are also doing training. There are links on the IMAGIN web site ([www.imagin.org](http://www.imagin.org)) providing this information. ESRI announced that they are offering Map Design with advanced ArcView scheduled for January 22.

Bill Enslin mentioned work the Center, MSU Library, and the DNR have been doing to project raster graphics, which the Center has acquired from the library. The raster graphics come in UTM coordinate by quadrangle. They will reproduce into state plane coordinates and MI GeoRef system. They have completed assembling one county file in MI GeoRef and it performs well in ArcView. It is faster than ArcInfo. They are writing onto CD ROMs for participants (13- 14 CDs are involved.) They will be having discussions soon regarding how to distribute. They put the framework file onto DRGs and it looks good. This will be used for DEQ Source Water Assessment Project to locate wells, which they hope will be on the right side of the roads.

Bill Enslin also reported that the Center has archived historic aerial photography flown over the last 20 years. The Center is refurbishing the archives. They have purchased plat maps of the state.

Bill Enslin reported that IMAGIN has relocated to 27300 Haggerty Road, Suite F-30, Farmington Hills, MI 48331. The new phone number is (248) 489-3972.

## IX. County / Local Projects and Activities

Tina Roberts, Wayne County, has a pilot area (Rouge east of Redford) for photogrammetry base at 1:1200 scale. They will be receiving 300 tiles in quarter mile squares per month for the next ten months. They are finalizing the request for proposal and expect it to go out in October.

## X. U.S. Census Bureau Regional Office TIGER Update

Gordon Rector, U.S. Bureau of the Census, reported that the TIGER updates are limited to taking updates from the boundary and annex survey maps from earlier this year. The updates are already in TIGER but weren't on the local maps. They are also plotting maps that will go to local governments for local review of addresses prior to the mailing of questionnaires – this only applies to communities which have signed up for this service. If a community doesn't identify an address, they can use the code 'j' - indicating that it is outside of their jurisdiction. The addresses won't be dropped off the list, but will be noted that the geography code is wrong. If they know the address belongs to the neighboring community, they can advise the Bureau. The main focus will be adding addresses that the Bureau doesn't have and making sure that they actually exist.

Rob Surber, MIC, added that the MIC has found when working with Qualified Voter Files (QVF,) that more than one township may claim the same address.

Gordon Rector stated that they would have to deal with that issue when they get the lists back from the communities.

Gordon Rector also stated that they collect boundary and annexation information from a survey conducted every spring. Early in the winter of 2000, the Bureau will ask the communities to notify them of boundaries as of January 1. The Bureau is gearing up for the program for rural communities' PO boxes and rural routes.

## XI. Federal Projects and Activities

Bill Kempisty, U.S. Army Corp. of Engineers, made the following corrections to the previous meeting minutes: add Berrien and Allegan Counties to the list of counties which had film available and flew their own color infrared leaf off photographs. The Corp. created multiple copies of digital orthos: one for U.S.G.S., two for the state, and one for the county. The Corp. is pushing the U.S.G.S. to release the NAPP that was collected in the spring of 1998.

Bill Kempisty reported that they have a contract to purchase of DRGs of the Great Lakes drainage base. These will be served across the Internet from the Detroit office. The Corp. will have a web site that will be similar to the U.S.G.S. web site.

Rob Surber, MIC, reported that at the U.S.G.S. conference it was stated that they plan to provide DRGs in GeoTiff format.

## XII. Michigan Utilities Projects and Activities

Nothing to report.

,

### XIII. Other Issues

Cary Andragna, Michigan State Industries (MSI), reported that they are expanding as a result of the transportation project. It will keep them busy for a long time. The City of Lansing also has some work for them to do. MSI couldn't have asked for better response. They are considering another location.

#### Next Meeting Date

October 8, 1998, 10 a.m. until 12 p.m. in the Lewis Cass Building, 320 S. Walnut, Lansing, MI – 1st Floor, north wing, Department of Management & Budget, Director's Conference Room